

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14-16 are pending.

Claims 1-12 and 14-16 are pending.

Claims 1, 7, and 12 are amended in similar ways, as to more specifically claim what a PID represents, where the PID would be part of an MPEG transport packet (see page 7, line 36 to page 8, line 1, page 9, lines 15-25 of the specification, formerly pending Claim 13 which is incorporated into Claim 12, and in other places). It should be noted that the PID would be part of the header of the MPEG transport packet, not the payload.

Claim 6 is amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner.

No new matter was added in view of these amendments.

I. Objection to Claim 6

The Examiner objected to Claim 6 for language purposes. The Applicants have amended Claim 6 in the manner stated by the Examiner.

II. 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection of Claims 1-12 and 14-16

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Manson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,543,051, hereafter referred to as 'Manson') in view of Zimmers et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,816,878, hereafter referred to as 'Zimmers').

In the previous rejection, the Applicants argued that the PID of Claim 13 (which has now been incorporated into Claims 1, 7, and 12) was not found in the cited art of Manson.

The Examiner responded to the Applicants arguments in the Office Action mailed April 10, 2008, by disagreeing with the Applicants by stating that the disclosed message name field (msg_name) of Manson is the same thing as a PID.

In response, the Applicants have specified that the PID referred to would be part of an MPEG transport packet. The PID for an MPEG transport packet for MPEG-2 is for example a 13 bit field which is used to contents of the transport packet, where in this case the contents (i.e., the payload) are identified as being an alert message.

The claimed use of PIDS is different than the structure of the EAM messages in Manson (with Zimmers) in that a PID in the present invention would be read as part of the transport bitstream, where a device receiving the MPEG transport packet could read a PID to know what is in the payload of the transport packet. In contrast, the invention of Manson with Zimmer would require one to read the contents of the payload which would be the contents of the emergency alert message shown in Table I of Manson.

That is, the msg_name field of Manson is not a PID, because the msg_name field represents only one of a plurality of fields in the disclosed EAS message, where the msg_name must be processed as well that the other elements of Table I to properly know what the alert message stands for. The purpose of the msg_name is so that a unique message name can be used, but the message name is one of the many fields that exist as part of the actual alert message.

The operation of using PIDs once again allows one to know the contents of a transport packet, without having to read the payload of the transport packet. The information disclosed in Manson with Zimmer concerning an alert message however is inherently already pulled out of an MPEG transport packet, which would not be the case of using PIDS as in Claims 1, 7, and 12.

Another point which makes this clear is that, as stated previously, the size of a PID for an MPEG-2 transport packet is defined as being 11 bits. In contrast, the size of the of the msg_name in Manson (in view of Zimmer) is 8 bytes. Is it is readily apparent that the size of the 8 bytes (64 bits) would require much more information than the use of the claimed PIDS of the present invention.

Obviously, the message name field by itself does not mean what the Examiner implies in the Office Action in that other fields of the alert message are used to identify what an alert message presents, (fields such as num_countries,

event_code, etc.), which means that the msg_name alone is not enough to understand what is in an alert message. In a very short time, in order to have something meaningful, Manson with Zimmer would require many more bytes than the use of PID, as in the present invention.

Therefore, Applicants submit that the claimed PID is not the same as the msg_name of Manson (with Zimmer), for the reasons given above, and the elements of Claims 1, 6, and 12 are not disclosed or suggested in Manson or in Zimmer, alone or in combination. Additionally, Claims 2-6, Claims 8-11, and Claims 14-16 are patentable for the reasons given above and that such claims depend on Claims 1, 7, and 12, respectively.

Accordingly, the allowance of the pending claims is respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6809, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joel M. Fogelson/

By: Joel M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43, 613
Phone (609) 734-6809

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
Suite 200
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
August 11, 2008